

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Boc. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspfo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,379	10/700,379 11/03/2003		Michael Alan Hermans	KCX-554-CIP (18134.1)	5984
22827	7590	08/25/2004		EXAMINER	
DORITY &		•	FORTUNA, JOSE A		
GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1731	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A	pplication No.	Applicant(s)	
		0/700,379	HERMANS ET AL.	
Office Action Summa	ry E	xaminer	Art Unit	
		osé A Fortuna	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this con Period for Reply	mmunication appear	s on the cover sheet v	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COM - Extensions of time may be available under the pr after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of the - If the period for reply specified above is less than - If NO period for reply is specified above, the max - Failure to reply within the set or extended period Any reply received by the Office later than three rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70	IMUNICATION. ovisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) his communication. thirty (30) days, a reply with imum statutory period will ap for reply will, by statute, cau months after the mailing date.). In no event, however, may a nin the statutory minimum of th oply and will expire SIX (6) MO se the application to become A	irreply be timely filed irry (30) days will be considered timely. NOTHS from the mailing date of this communication.	
Status				
1) Responsive to communication	(s) filed on 08 April	2004	•	
2a) This action is FINAL .		tion is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in con-			tters, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the				
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-83</u> is/are pending in	the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>57-73</u>	• •	om consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	_			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-56 and 74-83</u> is/are	rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected				
8) Claim(s) are subject to r	estriction and/or ele	ection requirement.		
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to	by the Examiner.			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is	s/are: a)∏ accepte	ed or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any				
			g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objec	ted to by the Exami	ner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a c		ority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None				
1. Certified copies of the pri				
2. Certified copies of the pri				
			received in this National Stage	
application from the Inter * See the attached detailed Office			received	
	adadii idi a list di (li	io oci illieu copies fiot	received.	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev	iew (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-14 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/05/04. 	149 or PTO/SB/08)		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Patent and Trademark Office				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-56 and 74-83 are, drawn to a "Single and Multi-plies Tissues," classified in class 162, subclass 109.
 - II. Claims 57-73, drawn to a "Process of making multi-ply tissues," classified in class 162, subclass 205.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a materially different process, such as by the use of shear inducing rolls to increase the Fuzz-on-edge property as disclosed by US Patent No. 6,585,855 B2.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,379 Page 3

Art Unit: 1731

5. During a telephone conversation with Timothy A. Cassidy on August 20, 2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-56 and 74-83. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 57-73 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,379

Art Unit: 1731

- 9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 11. Claims 1-56 and 74-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Archer et al., US Patent No. 6,077,590 in view of Klaubert et al., WO 01/85438 A2.

Archer et al. teach a rolled creped paper products having firmness, roll bulk and geometric mean tensile within the claimed range, see column 1, line 27, through column 2, line 4. Archer et al. fail to teach the fuzz-on-edge property as claimed. However, Klaubert et al. teach a process of increasing the softness of a tissue web by shearing the dried tissue between a nip formed by a fabric and a shearing roll or between shearing rolls, see abstract and figures. They teach that not only the softness is improved, but the void volume and fuzz-on edge property of the sheet/web is improved, see page 3, lines

Application/Control Number: 10/700,379

Art Unit: 1731

20-30 and on page 4, lines 11-15, Klaubert et al. teach that a greater fuzz-on-edge generally indicates a softer web and that the web obtained by the process has a fuzz-onedge of greater than 2.2 and particularly greater than 2.2 mm/mm. Therefore, applying the process taught by Klaubert et al. to the dried web taught by Archer et al. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to obtain a softer web, with improved absorbency, (improved void volume), i.e., improving tactile properties of the base web without a subsequent substantial loss in tensile strength, column 6, lines 7-14. As to the degree of firmness of the independent claims, Archer et al. teach the same levels of firmness as claimed, see claims and Klaubert et al. teach the same range of fuzzon-edge, see column 4, lines 5-15. Regarding the multi-ply tissue as claimed, one of ordinary skill in the would find obvious to forma multi-ply tissue by joining at least one the tissue web as taught by the combination of references, Archer et al. and Klaubert et al., to form a multi-ply structure, since this is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonable expectation of success if a multi-ply web is formed with at least one ply being a web as taught by the references.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure in the art of "Rolled Tissue products."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1731

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

José A Fortuna Primary Examiner

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1731